

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 26

Wednesday, July 1, 1959

News Section

GOLDWATER: <i>A boomlet rises</i>	(page 1)
GENEVA: <i>Post mortem</i>	(page 1)
DEMOCRATS: <i>The continuing muddle</i>	(page 2)
YOUNG GOP: <i>Voice of conservatism</i>	(page 3)
STATES' RIGHTS: <i>A step forward</i>	(page 3)

Goldwater to the Fore: A phenomenon is taking place in the Capital—a Senator from a small-population state, who personally doesn't want it, is being considered seriously for the GOP Presidential nomination. The unusual nature of the development is that some professionals are giving the matter much more than superficial consideration. In short, the pros are taking a second look at Barry Goldwater of Arizona.

Of course, various right-wing groups and figures have been talking about launching a Goldwater balloon. More important, however, Goldwater sentiment has been rising noticeably throughout the country. Until recently, only the "amateurs" were doing the talking. Now pros are showing no little interest, and they are engaging in some surprising flights of speculation.

Two reasons have sparked this talk among veterans who have had long experience with boomlets and booms. One is the kind of statements and sentiments attributed to Richard M. Nixon in the latest biography of the Vice President by the *New York Herald Tribune's* national political editor (*Richard M. Nixon*, by Earl Mazo, Harpers). Nixon, according to Mazo, said in 1954, "I'm through with politics." In 1956 he talked of quitting politics in disgust over the attempt to oust him as Vice-Presidential candidate. Today, says Mazo, Nixon's attitude is, "I don't intend to get on the treadmill Taft was on or that Stassen has been on—of going out and seeking the nomination at all costs."

Such statements cause chills among the pros who have been trying to get the Nixon bandwagon well on its way. They anxiously await repudiation or at least clarification of such matters by Nixon.

The second reason is that, unaccountably, Nixon seems to take a very lax interest in the race for his primary nomination in the key state of New Hampshire. His handling of this crucial matter has been incredibly inept. Not only in this important primary election, but in other matters, pros remark that Nixon is leaving vital fences "unmended." Whether this situation arises from Nixon's own decision, or from that of his entourage, is not known.

No wonder, therefore, that those politicians who do not want Rockefeller as the nominee under any circumstances, and have been counting on Nixon, now ponder the adage—"don't put all your eggs in one basket." One of them observed: "Dick ignores his personal safety—he was almost killed in that Caracas riot last year."

Once they begin thinking about Goldwater as a "possible," the pros have many arguments, to wit: (1) He won a smashing victory last fall as a Republican, in a state with an overwhelming Democratic registration. (2) "He's right on the ball on this labor question." They recall that Calvin Coolidge won the Vice-Presidency in 1920 over the pros' candidate, because the Massachusetts Governor had become a national hero as a result of his stern treatment of the Boston police strikers. A spontaneous demonstration on the convention floor did it.

(3) He's from the West and carries no taint of New York or Tom Dewey. (4) Pros are impressed by his obvious popularity among average citizens and his capability in arousing enthusiasm among followers. (5) He has a warm, human, infectious personality—attracting people of all sorts. (6) Nomination of candidates from small-population states (with only a limited number of delegates to the convention) are unprecedented—but these are times of realignment of parties, political flux and crumbling of party traditions. In these strange times, precedent may well be broken.

Unless Nixon grasps the tiller of his political vessel—warn old party hands—watch out for the Goldwater boom.

Post Mortem on Geneva: Along Washington's Diplomatic Row, the performance of the Secretary of State at Geneva and his speech on return to the US last week have won him the nickname of "No Compromise" Herter. But foreign diplomats say it would be more accurate to say "No Further Compromise" Herter.

For, they emphasize, the Secretary compromised, or submitted to the British desire to compromise, on the Berlin question as follows: (1) The Western offer to recognize check-point police of the East German (Communist) Government as "agents of Soviet Russia" constituted an indirect step toward the recognition of the puppet East German regime.

(2) Also, the Western agreement to stop all radio propaganda beamed to the East from Berlin would have (if the Russians had accepted the deal) cut off one of the best sources of hope and encouragement which the enslaved Eastern European area has been receiving.

(3) We agreed to reduce substantially Western armed forces (now 11,000) in West Berlin, without asking Gromyko for the obvious *quid pro quo*, reduction of Russian forces in East Berlin. Thus—remark diplomats—it is quite incorrect to say that Herter "stood firm" and brooked no compromise.

What should we have done? Our foreign diplomatic friends answer the question: the US should not have been affected by the British pleas for appeasement, but should have simply supported the French proposal, namely, to hold free elections in both West and East

Germany on the question of union of both Germanies. And that should have been the limit of our diplomacy at Geneva.

Furthermore, the blunt Soviet rejection of our concessions should have been met with a curt diplomatic retort:

The US should have immediately cancelled the visit of Vice President Nixon to Moscow. That—it is pointed out—is the sort of language the Muscovites understand. It is not—they say—too late to do so. And, finally, the US should rule out any participation in a summit meeting.

If the Soviets should return to the norms of civilized international intercourse, then an envoy should be sent to Moscow to open the American Exhibition there (this was the excuse for sending Nixon). Now, instead of Vice President Nixon, Diplomatic Row suggests that President Eisenhower delegate the mission of opening the American exhibition to former President Herbert Hoover. The doughty 85-year-old statesman would doubtless remind the Soviet people how, after World War I, he organized the mission to Russia, financed by the American people, which fed and saved the lives of millions of Russians in one of the worst famines the unfortunate people of that country have endured under the Soviet regime.

Nuclear War: A congressional committee has been staging hearings designed to frighten the American public by giving abundant details of the consequences to American communities of an all-out nuclear attack by an enemy—obviously Russia. The committee did not and had no intention of presenting any new evidence of the effects and horrors of such an attack. Most of the details have been widely known and published often before.

Observers on Capitol Hill wonder why the presentation of such a picture of destruction of American cities has taken place at this time. Some members of Congress suggested that one motive might be the creation of popular sentiment in this country in favor of a treaty banning nuclear tests. Such a treaty has been for some time under negotiation in Switzerland, subject to typical Soviet obstructionism.

Sponsoring the performance is the Radiation Subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D.-N.M.) is chairman of the parent organization. It is recalled that he was the most determined, if not the most passionate, of the adversaries of former Atomic Energy Commission Director Lewis L. Strauss during the last six months when the latter's confirmation for the post of Secretary of Commerce was fanatically fought by Anderson and his friends in the Senate. Strauss, when AEC head, was credited with an important role in the development of the hydrogen bomb—a development which was opposed by AEC scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer. Under Strauss' regime in AEC, Oppenheimer was investigated and labeled a "security risk," and ousted from the agency.

Two weeks ago, Anderson and other anti-Strauss Democratic Senators won their fight against the former AEC head, and his confirmation failed by a narrow vote. Last week Anderson took an active part in the first

day "curtain-raiser" of the Radiation Subcommittee's show.

The chairman of the subcommittee is Representative Chet Holifield (D.-Calif.), who has a voting record 100 per cent along the line of the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA). This organization, pro-appeasement and socialistic, gave Holifield highest honors in its scoresheet for last year's session of Congress.

Holifield said he was putting on the show to clear up "confusion" in the public mind of the effects of nuclear weapons. He said he would not work out details of damage which could be inflicted on Russia—to avoid a charge of "warmongering."

Many on Capitol Hill ask: What purpose is served by presenting such a performance, particularly since the essential details have been published in the press many times during recent years? Some suggest that one result may be the spreading of a popular sentiment for a "preventive war."

Others comment that the work of Holifield's committee might better have been devoted to a study detailing what results would follow an American hydrogen bomb attack on Soviet Russia and its satellites; and the broadcasting of such a picture by Radio Free Europe or other stations beamed to the public on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

One member of the committee, Representative Craig Hosmer (R.-Calif.), suggested that an adverse outcome of the show might be the stimulation of a surrender sentiment in the US on the basis that life under Communist control would be better than the killing of millions of people in a nuclear war.

Democratic Dilemmas: Democratic Senate Leader Lyndon B. Johnson is squirming, caught between his actions on the Senate floor and his ambitions to become President, but he is not alone. Other Democratic hopefuls find themselves in similar unhappy situations. Thus, front-running Senator John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), hewing strictly to the socialistic "liberal" line (including desegregation), received a visit from Governor John D. Patterson of Alabama; at the end of the colloquy, Patterson told the press he would be for Kennedy for the Democratic nomination. Patterson, it should be pointed out, is a strongly segregationist Governor. Left-wing elements in the party, including Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, one of Kennedy's rivals for the nomination, have not overlooked this incident.

However, another and more serious embarrassment is coming up for the young hopeful from Massachusetts. On September 19, in Kennedy's home town of Boston, former President Truman will preside over a \$100-a-plate banquet avowedly designed to raise \$250,000 for the legal defense of Matthew Connelly, Truman's former White House aide. Connelly was convicted in 1956, together with T. Lamar Caudle, another Truman Administration aide, on charges of conspiring to defraud the Government of their services, by attempting to delay prosecution of a St. Louis businessman on a Federal income tax evasion charge. Appeals by Connelly and Caudle have been rejected by the Supreme Court.

The scheduled Boston affair has caused a veritable panic among Democrats in Washington, with many ar-

ranging "previous engagements," preferably in Honolulu or Europe, so as to be as far away as possible from what they consider will be an enormous party liability. But Truman, faithful to his aide, wants a big and illustrious turnout.

The dinner will prove a liability not only to Senator Kennedy (who has tried to wear a "new look" with no connections with the era of the "Truman Scandals"), but also to another Democratic Presidential hopeful, Senator Stuart Symington. "Sanctimonious Stu," as Joe McCarthy called him, owes most of his pre-convention support to Truman. It is believed that the former President (still quite a power in party councils, especially at conventions) will be very much offended unless Symington attends the dinner. The Missouri Senator—say his colleagues—is indeed on the spot: For what will be the reaction of many Democratic voters who are not tolerant of corruption and who have been inclined favorably towards Symington, if he shows up at such a function?

Young GOP—Special Report: America's growing conservative movement exploded into the headlines last week, as the Young Republican Federation staged a sensation-packed convention in Denver, Colorado.

The YR's, in a series of rousing floor fights, openly repudiated "modern Republicanism," and made it clear that they are tough-minded conservatives who mean to think for themselves.

Among other actions, the Young GOP:

- Came out overwhelmingly against Federal aid to education.

- *Shouted through an angry motion of censure against GOP Senators Margaret Chase Smith (Me.) and William Langer (N.D.) for their votes in opposition to Lewis L. Strauss.*

- Loudly booed the name of Chief Justice Earl Warren when one delegate referred to him as a "great American," then flatly declared that Supreme Court rulings "may legitimately be open to criticism and legislative alteration."

These and similar episodes, as observed in detail by HUMAN EVENTS sources on the scene, added up to a sweeping victory for conservatism. The new national YR chairman, Ned Cushing of Kansas, was elected by a solid coalition of conservative states, including most of the South, the Midwest and the West.

The balloting for officers was a drubbing for the "big" states that traditionally rule in political conventions, and a humiliating defeat for the agents of Nelson Rockefeller. In their behind-the-scenes deliberations, the New York leaders had ruled out candidate Cushing from the start. The grounds: "too conservative." New York—according to inside reports coming to HUMAN EVENTS—wanted a candidate who "would not campaign for Nixon."

In its attempt to halt Cushing, the Rockefeller contingent went down to defeat with "liberal" delegations from Pennsylvania, Illinois and Michigan.

The YR's adopted a resolution declaring that President Eisenhower's trip to Geneva in 1955 had "dealt a severe blow to the morale of the captive nations," and opposing further such meetings "until such time as there is tangible evidence that the Communist regime is ready to honor its diplomatic agreements as a civilized nation."

The plank on the Supreme Court stated that "we do not believe that the Court should usurp the functions rightfully belonging to other branches of our Government."

On labor, the YR's demanded strict curtailment of union boss political activity at the expense of union members. "Liberal" papers made much of the absence of a right-to-work plank, but ignored a spirited right-to-work debate which developed over Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley law (permitting states to ban compulsory unionism—by right-to-work laws). The convention heavily endorsed this right-to-work clause.

Wayne Morse: In cloakrooms, some talk arises about possible censure of Senator Wayne Morse, following the devastating criticism of the Oregon Democrat delivered in a speech, on June 24, by Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.). The Arizonan quoted a number of vituperative epithets and phrases Morse had applied to other Senators and men in public life. Morse's description of the devoted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles comes as a shock: "This evil man, bent on war . . ."; or of Democratic Senator Richard L. Neuberger (Oreg.), as "amoral," "cowardly," "untrustworthy," "deceitful."

Goldwater listed an impressive number of public figures, Democratic as well as Republican, who have been smeared by Morse. Invoking the necessity for the US Senate to maintain decorum and dignity in its proceedings, Goldwater quoted over 40 unseemly epithets or phrases hurled by Morse at public men (including Admiral Lewis L. Strauss).

States' Rights: Conservatives scored a major legislative victory last week when the House passed, by a comfortable margin, a Court-curbing bill. A coalition of 114 Republicans and 111 Democrats (mostly from the South) did the trick. The vote was 225 to 192.

The Department of Justice and the "liberals" in the House tried desperately to block the measure on the grounds that H.R. 3 was confusingly worded and would lead to lengthy litigation. During debate preceding the vote, however, Representative William M. Colmer (D.-Miss.) placed the measure in a clear perspective when he said:

"It simply provides that the Supreme Court shall not strike down an otherwise constitutional state law simply because the Congress has enacted a law dealing with the same subject. . . ."

The legislation now faces a rugged fight in the Senate, where a similar bill failed to carry by just one vote last year. Conservatives are hopeful, nevertheless, that a strongly supporting write-in campaign from the people will bring Senate passage of the bill this year. Write-in campaigns, thus far in this session, have been highly successful in slowing down the big spending programs of the "liberal" members of Congress.

Capitol Camera: Several months ago, a signed petition appeared in the "liberal" *Washington Post* calling for the abolishment of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Two sponsors of the petition were Ben Shahn, pro-Communist artist whose works are scheduled to be shown at the Moscow art fair this summer, and . . . Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

● Richard H. Rovere, who has written a new book—*Senator Joe McCarthy*—which is an extension of his vicious article that appeared in *Esquire* magazine last year, was, during 1938, an associate editor of the Communist publication, *New Masses*.

● Last week's biggest labor front surprise was created by the extreme left-wing American Civil Liberties Union. In testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor, the ACLU reversed a seven-year stand against Federal labor reform legislation by finally acknowledging that it is a "necessary evil."

● The sound dollar crusade continues to pick up momentum. Last week the *New York Journal-American* added its name to a growing list of newspapers which have conducted anti-inflation campaigns and published coupons for the use of readers to appeal to their Congressmen for restoration of a sound dollar.

Labor Front: "More than 27 million Americans—owners and employees of small businesses—are now at the mercy of labor union racketeers because of deficiencies in existing laws," Representative Edgar W. Hiestand (R.-Calif.), prominent member of the House Labor Committee, said recently. He added that the Senate-passed bill, sponsored by Democratic Presidential hopeful John F. Kennedy (Mass.), does not rectify this deplorable situation.

Hiestand has made a study of the effect of labor boss rule on small business and finds that there are three million such concerns that are virtually helpless against exactions by Hoffa, Reuther *et al*, and the law gives these business establishments no protection. From Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration of the Federal Government, Hiestand gets this size-up: "Since their financial resources are extremely limited, they (small business concerns) are unable to resist the economic pressures exerted against them with impunity by the powerful labor organizations. For these firms, the rights guaranteed to employers in the Taft-Hartley Act have no practical significance . . . they have no rights at all."

The Small Business Administration attacks such abuses as organizational picketing (sometimes called blackmail picketing), used widely by the Hoffa goons; and secondary boycotts, such as the pressure put on the plumbers to boycott the Kohler Company (see "Can Reuther's Boycott Bring Kohler to its Knees?" in *HUMAN EVENTS* for February 23, 1957).

The Small Business Administration explains the threat of blackmail picketing: "The employer is given to understand that, if he fails to agree [to his employees being organized or reorganized], a picket line (composed of strangers) will be thrown about his plant to intimidate his suppliers and customers, as well as his employees."

"This is a formidable threat because few small concerns have the economic stamina to hold out against picket pressure."

"On the other hand, if he signs a contract, he will betray the right of his employees to select their own representatives. Moreover, the employees may strike his plant in protest."

The SBA further points out that the National Labor Relations Board offers no certain protective tribunal against abuses to many small employers. It has had to decline jurisdiction, because of filled dockets, in cases of many small concerns whose annual volume of business does not qualify their cases for review.

Congressman Hiestand vows that the Kennedy bill, if and when it reaches the floor, will be rigorously amended.

Education: Senator Karl E. Mundt (R.-S.D.) draws the attention of *HUMAN EVENTS* to activities in the Senate Subcommittee on Education, now studying the controversial "loyalty oath clause"—presently a part of the National Defense Education Act. Because some college and university professors consider written affirmation of allegiance to the US an affront to the intelligence, the subcommittee is now in the process of striking that section from the act, leaving nothing in its place.

Senator Mundt, however, in a recent appearance before the subcommittee, noted that communism's attitude toward this country has not changed, and he proposed the following safeguard: In the absence of an oath, any individual who applies for a payment or loan under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act—and who has been a member of a subversive organization within five years of his application—is subject to fine, imprisonment or both.

The South Dakotan left "liberal" members of the subcommittee at a loss for rebuttal when he concluded:

"I do not believe we should stand before the people and say we have an act that provides for our national defense and . . . [do nothing] . . . to prevent its being used as an offensive mechanism by the Communist apparatus . . . trying to destroy this country, by making this [tax] money available to students whose loyalties are demonstrably to some other country than our own."

REV. Z. M. BRESSLER, First Congregational Church, Ashland, Neb.: "*HUMAN EVENTS*—the best political analysis of any I have known."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1000 copies \$30. In lots of 5000 \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1.

Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year. FOREIGN: \$14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, \$21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, \$36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of *HUMAN EVENTS*) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of *HUMAN EVENTS* . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher

JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher

FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

JOHN R. BENEDICT, Assistant Editor

NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, Assistant Editor

Article Section I

Bleeding the Railroads

How the Law Sanctions Shakedowns By Unions

By FRANK CHODOROV

THE SAD PLIGHT of most of the railroads springs from a variety of causes, through no fault of management. But probably the most spectacular evil forced on the companies is the chronic disease of featherbedding—a practice which is nothing but tribute exacted by monopoly unions for giving the railroads permission to stay in business. The total of these exactions has been estimated at a half billion dollars a year.

When the railroads had little or no competition, it was not difficult to pass this charge on to the shippers and passengers, for in those days it was true that “Jones pays all the freight.” But, with the advent of airplanes, trucks, buses and private cars, Jones quite heartlessly began to scrutinize transportation costs and to make decisions unfavorable to the railroads. He took his trade elsewhere. As a result, the revenues of many railroads are not sufficient to meet both the legitimate operational costs and the tribute exactions. And the squeeze has been showing up on their books in blotches of red ink.

Featherbedding is particularly insidious in the railroad business because it is sanctified by both statute law and “administrative law.” Long before the New Deal the railroads were put under the ministration of regulatory laws and subjected to the rules of a bureaucratic body. As usual, the bureaucracy, with an ear attuned to the political effect of its administrative acts, has been sympathetic toward the demands of the powerful railroad unions. Thus, the tribute—or featherbedding—has been shored up with legality.

We can begin back in 1919, when a Government commission undertook to define a “day,” as it applies to wages in the railroad business. It was decided that a “day” consists of either eight hours or the time it takes a train to cover 100 miles. There was some sense in this dual definition, for in those days the average freight train speed was less than 12.5 miles an hour and a crew actually worked eight hours on a 100 mile run.

Today the diesel engine can pull a longer train nearly twice as fast, so that a “day,” as far as wages are concerned, has been shortened considerably. In 1958, the average through freight train covered 100 miles in four and three-quarter hours.

Or, as some contracts stipulate, crew members can continue on the train and collect eight hours’ pay for every 100 miles they are on it. It is not

unusual, therefore, for a crew to draw down two or even four days’ pay for eight hours on the road. This has the blessing of the unions, but not of the railroad user.

This peculiar definition of a “day” is only the beginning of the featherbedding miseries of the railroads. The list is long, with tragicomic overtones.

It takes only a few minutes to couple an airhose but, under union rules only a qualified carman is permitted to do the chore, and if in an emergency a trainman should be impressed for the job, he is entitled to a penalty payment for the few minutes’ work. Diesel engines need not be stoked and have no boilers to tend; but the unions have decreed that every diesel engine must carry a fireman, not only for the ride but also for the pay; this “service” costs the railroads \$200 million a year. Oh yes, the fireman may be called upon to push a button to start the engine, and in that case, as a governmental referee decided in a recent case, he is entitled to an extra day’s pay. The decision was based on a pre-diesel ruling, which provided extra pay for the then hard job of firing up pressure for steam locomotives.

REFEREES have come up with some weird decisions. A road freight engineer demanded an extra day’s pay for moving his train the length of the freight yard, a job reserved for yard engineers only; he got it. For pulling a freight train out of drifting snow—a four mile road trip—a yard crew was awarded an extra day’s wages. For walking 15 steps to couple a road diesel engine to a bad-order engine, a road service brakeman got himself an extra 100-mile compensation.

“An eastern railroad,” reports *Railway Age*, “paid a maintenance of way engineer and a fireman to operate a steam ditcher on a yard track. It also had to pay an engine service engineer and a fireman for not operating the steam ditcher. They just sat by and watched.” This is the job classification gimmick so dear to pocket-picking unionists. In one case, a maintenance of way fireman did not report for work and an engine service fireman was impressed for the emergency; for this he was paid an extra day’s pay.

Officially, a steamroller working on asphalt becomes a train when it operates between rails; this was decided when an alert conductor and two brakemen called attention to the fact that a steamroller was working on a track, and for their alertness in

rechristening the machine, they were awarded a day's pay each.

To repair a water leak over a switch is a simple job for one able-bodied man. By union decree, this job calls for the services of a crew, consisting of a maintenance of way man, a plumber's helper and a sheet-metal worker. A car painter may paint cars, but heaven forbid that he mount a scaffold to paint a car shed. Because a crew was called at 7:30 a.m.—a half hour before the usual starting time—they were awarded 20 hours' pay by a Government referee, according to *Railway Age*.

It was figured thus: eight hours for the regular day, eight hours for the extra half-hour (since that constituted another day), and because the work was completed on the same day on which it was begun, the second day was considered overtime and the men entitled to time-and-a-half. Could Einstein have done any better? A passenger fireman received an extra day's pay at brakeman's rates because he pulled a switch while taking his engine to the roundhouse.

FEATHERBEDDING is a disease which attacks every branch of the railroad business. If an office clerk has more work than he can handle, his sidekick with nothing to do may not help him out, because such help would reduce overtime work. An order was telephoned to a conductor because the nearest telegraph operator was 232 miles away. The telegrapher complained that this was trespassing on his job, that the railroad should have provided him with transportation for the 232 miles so that he could have performed his duty; his complaint was upheld and he was awarded the pay he lost by the transgression. The Chicago and Northwestern has hundreds of one-man stations; all of them must, by union fiat, be manned by agents, some of whom "labor" less than ten minutes on any given day and are paid at a rate that comes to \$150 per hour, for actual production time.

Some states have added to the fun by passing special featherbedding laws. The Arkansas "full crew" law is an excellent example. This law demands that every freight train consisting of 25 cars or more must carry, while operating in this sovereign commonwealth, an extra brakeman; the excess hand, who boards the train at the state line, is called the "lawman." (The Arkansas law is particularly interesting because it stipulates—and it was passed in 1909—that the extra brakeman must be employed "regardless of any modern improvement.") The Missouri-Pacific estimates that the cost of the useless "lawman" has surpassed \$1 million.

We have been reading in the newspapers about attempts of the railroads to abandon non-paying operations, like ferryboats, side roads that have lost their customers, and so on. The difficult condition of the railroads has prompted the Government to permit discontinuance of some of these operations. But the unions are not in the least interested in the solvency of the companies that provide employment, and they make use of every device to either prevent savings or to make them costly.

Thus, when a railroad abolished an obsolete yard service, the union brought charges and three years later won a decision whereby the railroads had to pay the members of the yard crew all the money they would have earned had the yard continued to

operate; one man had become a postmaster, another a farmer and the third was in jail.

In 1947 an agreement was negotiated whereby a useless yard service may be discontinued if the union agrees that a yard service is unjustified, but to get the union to agree is all but impossible. Some savings are effected by removing the yard engine; but the yard crew must be kept on the payroll. If per chance a road freight should happen to visit the yard, the yard crew uses the engine to perform the few chores, while the road crew merrily collects pay.

And so it goes *ad nauseam* and *ad nauseam*—to the tune of a half billion dollars, a sum that the railroads could well use to replace obsolete road equipment and thus put themselves in a better competitive position. The theory behind featherbedding is that it makes work. The argument is that there is only so much work the railroads can give the men ("work-load"), regardless of the amount of business they do, and if the work is stretched out, more men will have more employment.

THE FIGURES, however, show that featherbedding has tended to decrease the number of jobs. In 1921 the average number of railroad employees was 1,659,513, according to a study made by *Railway Age*. In April, 1959, when the latest figures were published, the average had dropped to 824,860. The reason for the drop was not featherbedding but technological improvements and the loss of business to competitors. However, the loss of business was due to the high freight and passenger rates the railroads were asking, as compared to those of Government-aided competitors, and the relatively high rates were in good part due to featherbedding.

If one were to look for further theoretical justification of featherbedding, one would come to the familiar (Marxist) wages-fund theory, which holds that wages have no relation to productivity. The capitalists set the wages of their workers at or near the subsistence level, and the only thing the workers can do to improve their condition is to fight for a little bit more. The theory discards the fact that wages come from production.

Regardless of the theory, what can be done to relieve the railroads of this back breaking burden? Nothing—except to (a) deprive the regulatory bureaucracy of its quasi-judicial interference in wage disputes, and (b) depriving the unions of the monopoly position guaranteed them by the labor laws.

Frank Chodorov's latest book is *The Rise and Fall of Society*, price \$3.95. Copies may be purchased from HUMAN EVENTS.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "BLEEDING THE RAILROADS" at \$ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Article Section II

Hail to the Chief

A Review of 'The Herbert Hoover Story'

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

The Herbert Hoover Story is published by HUMAN EVENTS—price \$5.90. Buy copies for yourself, your children and your friends, for your high school, college, public library. We will supply patriotic organizations free circulars for all their members.

EUGENE LYONS' *The Herbert Hoover Story* was first published in 1948 as *Our Unknown Ex-President*. Now, as the man whom Raymond Moley has called "the greatest Republican of his generation" is approaching his eighty-fifth birthday (the date is August 10), the original title has quite obviously become a misnomer. Herbert Hoover—"The Chief" to a loyal legion that never forgot him—has quite tangibly and visibly "come back."

In the renascence of a reputation, Mr. Lyons' book, which surprised its author at the time of its first issue by becoming a best seller, played a part. The book, a full-length portrait rather than a biography, is warm, mellow, genial, wise and humane—a complete refutation of the caricature that had been foisted on a generation of the young by the heavily endowed smear job that had been masterminded by Charles Michelson, long-time head of the press division of the Democratic National Committee. There is, however, a much deeper reason for Herbert Hoover's recovered popularity. His ideas have come back.

Mr. Lyons intimates as much in a 1959 postscript which he has written for this new issue of his book. Though disagreement with Hoover's views is, as he says, "still widespread," the "hate Hoover" chorus has died away to a few whispers in unseemly places. If a Democratic Presidential candidate were to "run against Hoover," in 1960, he would discover that the incantations which worked for Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman for five campaigns had lost all their magic.

The reason is that the Roosevelt ideas have been discredited by events which have had an uncanny way of conforming to Herbert Hoover's own predictions and expectations. This has happened in both the domestic and the foreign fields.

As Mr. Lyons points out in a chapter called "Ordeal by Abuse," the Communists played no small role throughout the 'thirties and the 'forties in stirring the foul anti-Hoover broths. The Communists and the fellow travellers hated Hoover for his calm certainty that Stalin would doublecross anyone who became allied with him. For a time this

was enough to earn Hoover the slanderous appellation of "Hitler lover," a sobriquet which he shared with Bob Taft. The passions of the World War II period had effectively dimmed out the memory that Hoover knew all about wars and their aftermaths.

He had protested in 1918 and 1919 against the folly of starving inoffensive German children. He had warned against the punitive war reparations. He had even joined his voice to that of Bernard Baruch in advising Woodrow Wilson to eschew a personal trip to Paris in favor of dealing coolly with Clemenceau and Lloyd George at arm's—or, rather, the Atlantic cable's—length. This record for prescience did Hoover no good at a time when Roosevelt was confidently bandying quips with Stalin about Churchill's "imperialism" in the matter of India and Hong Kong. But now it is Roosevelt who looks like the gull, not Hoover.

MR. LYONS does not take an "I told you so" tone in his book when it comes to dealing with Hoover's opponents. He has been thoroughly imbued with Hoover's own dislike of prophets who wear a mantle of holier-than-thou rectitude. Hoover has never enjoyed "Roosevelt stories." Even when the worst drippings from the "Michelson Mills" were poisoning our public life, Hoover refused to reply in kind. But he has insisted on setting the record straight.

This record, as Mr. Lyons demonstrates in the last third of his book, utterly refutes the Michelson-fostered legend that Hoover was a "do nothing" President. As Secretary of Commerce in the Harding and Coolidge cabinets, Hoover had warned against the New Era speculative fevers. He had tried to put credit brakes on the boom which had its center in Wall Street. But Coolidge, who really believed in "doing nothing," would not listen to his Secretary of Commerce. When Hoover eventually went to the White House, he forced the Senate to investigate the Stock Exchange. But in his efforts to deal with Wall Street he got no help from Gover-

nor Franklin D. Roosevelt in Albany, whose office was primarily responsible for New York Stock Exchange regulations.

When Mr. Lyons was writing his book in 1947 and 1948 it had been pretty well forgotten that "Eastern finance," both in 1928 and 1932, tended to be anti-Hoover. After all, it was John J. Raskob, the du Ponts and other men of wealth who financed the operation of the "Michelson Mills" during the Hoover tenure of the White House. Hoover was distrusted by Old Guard Republicans because he insisted that Government must take positive action during a depression. On the other hand, Hoover won no accolade from the so-called "Progressive" Republicans for his insistence that Government efforts in combatting depression should take the form of committees set up on state and municipal levels, and that the local committees should avail themselves largely of voluntary contributions of both time and money. Even where Hoover reluctantly acquiesced in the formation of national relief agencies (such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation), he insisted on provisions for their automatic extinction after the job was done.

MR. LYONS, who spends some rueful pages on the subject of Hoover's deficiencies as a politician, thinks the Republicans did a poor job in 1929-32 in explaining and dramatizing the man-sized task which "The Chief" had performed in turning the depression. Mr. Lyons has collected the health statistics for 1929-32; they show quite definitively that nobody "starved." The American economy had for three long years withstood shock after shock, most of which had originated in a Europe that had not yet managed to "digest" World War I. By August of 1932 a ponderable upturn was under way. True, the American banking system was shaky. But many of the bank closings of early 1933 could have been averted if President-elect Roosevelt had been willing to cooperate with the outgoing Administration in efforts to allay the panic.

What Roosevelt did after assuming office was to stop the tide of natural recovery. Instead of fostering a sound cure, the New Dealers proceeded to "institutionalize" the depression. They adopted the NRA—an essentially fascist "corporative state" idea for limiting markets and sustaining artificially high prices. (Hoover had turned down the NRA idea during his term of office.) Worst of all, the New Dealers methodically debauched the dollar. When their inflationary tactics failed to create employment (it took the armament boom of World War II to bail the New Deal out), they blamed the "mature economy" for the necessity of bureaucratizing such programs as WPA, PHA and Rural Resettlement.

Roosevelt's inflation-puffed relief supplied less bread in the long run than would have been avail-

able if the Hoover local-relief policies had been allowed to proceed. But the Nation, for a time, went into joyful contortions over the Rooseveltian circuses. Meanwhile, the circus masters built their bureaucratic and Parkinsonian "empires" in Washington. When a sobered Nation eventually took stock of the swollen bureaucracies after World War II, it turned to Hoover for advice on how to purge the cancerous growths. Task forces set in motion by Herbert Hoover have indicated how billions could be excised from the cost of Government. Some of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been acted upon. The trouble is, however, that for every elimination of an old abuse the bureaucracy succeeds in inventing ten or twelve new ones. What we need is an overall task force for the lopping off of hydra heads.

It is the latter third of Mr. Lyons' book that will have political meaning for the coming generations. But the political meaning will never be properly understood if Mr. Lyons' readers fail to appreciate the first two-thirds of the story, which takes Hoover from his humble beginnings as an Iowa blacksmith's son to his great success as businessman and voluntary humanitarian. Herbert Hoover's adventures in the far corners of the earth as the most accomplished mining engineer of his generation make for exciting reading. Incidentally, they show how a Quaker individualist combined money-making with the most scrupulous observance of the promptings of a Quaker conscience. Again, Mr. Lyons' story of the Hoover-directed relief of Belgium and the post-World War I "salvaging of a continent" demonstrates how individualism can be made to spark large voluntary succoring of the needy. The Hoover methods were just as successful in their immediate impact as any Marshall Plan—and they did not leave a self-perpetuating bureaucracy of professional leeches as their permanent heritage.

Mr. Lyons' 1959 postscript to his book offers a genial summary of Mr. Hoover's "retirement" program, which consists of working at least 16 hours a day. The old Quaker voluntarist is still practicing what he preaches. When a majority of Americans choose to emulate him, our woes will at last be firmly under control.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "HAIL TO THE CHIEF" at \$ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____